

1 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
2 LAUREN R. GOLDMAN
3 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
4 lgoldman@gibsondunn.com
5 200 Park Avenue
6 New York, NY 10166
7 Telephone: (212) 351-4000
8 Facsimile: (212) 351-4035
9
10 ELIZABETH K. MCCLOSKEY, SBN 268184
11 emccloskey@gibsondunn.com
12 ABIGAIL A. BARRERA, SBN 301746
13 abarrera@gibsondunn.com
14 555 Mission Street, Suite 3000
15 San Francisco, CA 94105
16 Telephone: (415) 393-8200
17 Facsimile: (415) 393-8306

18 ANDREW M. KASABIAN, SBN 313210
19 333 South Grand Avenue
20 Los Angeles, CA 90071 USA
21 Telephone: (213) 229-7311
22 Facsimile: (213) 229-6311
23 akasabian@gibsondunn.com

24
25 *Attorneys for Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.*
26 *(formerly known as Facebook, Inc.)*

27 COOLEY LLP
28 MICHAEL G. RHODES, SBN 116127
rhodesmg@cooley.com
KYLE C. WONG, SBN 224021
kwong@cooley.com
CAROLINE A. LEBEL, SBN 340067
clebel@cooley.com
3 Embarcadero Center, 20th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-4004
Telephone: (415) 693-2000
Facsimile: (415) 693-2222

15
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
18 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

19
20 JANE DOE, individually and on behalf of all
21 others similarly situated,

22 Plaintiff,

23 v.

24 HEY FAVOR, INC., FULLSTORY, INC.,
25 META PLATFORMS, INC., TIKTOK,
INC., AND BYTEDANCE INC.,

26 Defendants.

27 Case No. 3:23-cv-00059-WHO

28 **DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD
BE RELATED**

CLASS ACTION

1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 3-12 and 7-11 of the United States District Court for the Northern
 3 District of California, counsel for Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc. submits this Administrative Motion
 4 to consider whether *Jane Doe v. GoodRx Holdings, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:23-cv-00501-LB, filed in
 5 this District on February 2, 2023, should be related to the above-captioned action, *Jane Doe v. Hey*
 6 *Favor, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:23-cv-00059-WHO, filed in this District on January 5, 2023.

7 Under Civil Local Rule 3-12(a), “[a]n action is related to another when: (1) [t]he actions
 8 concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction, or event; and (2) [i]t appears likely that
 9 there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases
 10 are conducted before different judges.” Under this standard, *GoodRx* and *Hey Favor* are related cases.

11 Plaintiff in *Hey Favor* alleges that defendant Hey Favor, a telemedicine company and direct-
 12 to-consumer pharmacy, incorporated software development kits (“SDKs”) and pixels on the Hey Favor
 13 platform. (*Hey Favor* Dkt. 1 ¶ 26.) As a result, Plaintiff alleges Hey Favor permitted third-party
 14 “Advertising and Analytics Defendants,” including Meta, TikTok, and FullStory, to “intercept users’
 15 health data and other highly sensitive information,” including users’ prescription information . . .
 16 answers to health questions . . . medication side effects, allergies, age, and weight.” (*Hey Favor* Dkt.
 17 1 ¶ 13.)

18 Plaintiff in *GoodRx* alleges that defendant GoodRx, a telehealth and prescription coupon
 19 company, incorporated SDKs and pixels on the GoodRx platform. (*GoodRx* Dkt. 1 ¶ 18.) As a result,
 20 Plaintiff alleges GoodRx permitted third-party “Advertising and Analytics Defendants,” including
 21 Meta, Google, and Criteo, to “intercept[] Plaintiff and Class members’ personal information, including
 22 health information relating to their medical conditions, symptoms, and prescriptions, communicated
 23 through the GoodRx Platform.” (*GoodRx* Dkt. 1 ¶ 17-18.)

24 Based on these allegations, plaintiffs in both cases bring the following claims: 1) intrusion upon
 25 seclusion; 2) unjust enrichment; 3) violation of the California Confidentiality of Medical Information
 26 Act (“CMIA”) §§ 56.06, 56.101, and 56.10; 4) aiding and abetting violation of the CMIA §§ 56.06,
 27 56.101, and 56.10; 5) violation of CMIA § 56.36; and 6) violation of the California Invasion of Privacy
 28 Act (“CIPA”) §§ 631 and 632. Plaintiff in *GoodRx* brings two additional claims, for violation of the

1 California Consumers Legal Remedies Act (“CLRA”) and for violation of the California Unfair
 2 Competition Law (“UCL”).

3 In addition, each complaint seeks certification of a nationwide class of “[a]ll natural persons in
 4 the United States who used the [Hey Favor or GoodRx] Platform and whose communications and/or
 5 data were shared with third parties, including the Advertising and Analytics Defendants.” (*Hey Favor*
 6 Dkt. 1 ¶ 158; *GoodRx* Dkt. 1 ¶ 166.)

7 *Hey Favor* and *GoodRx* “concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction, or
 8 event.” Civ. L.R. 3-12(a). Both cases name Meta as a defendant. The plaintiffs in each case allege
 9 that they used platforms on which SDKs and pixels were installed, and claim that, as a result, Meta and
 10 other defendants received sensitive health information about them. This degree of overlap warrants
 11 relation. *See, e.g., Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. v. Takeda Pharmaceutical Co.*, 2013 WL 12221673, at
 12 *2-3 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 28, 2013) (granting motion to relate where the actions shared the same defendant,
 13 concerned same patent, and concern the same transaction or event). Although *Hey Favor* and *GoodRx*
 14 include different defendants in addition to Meta, the actions concern the same “transaction[] or event”:
 15 third parties’ receipt of alleged “health information” from an online prescription drug provider through
 16 SDKs and pixels. *See Pepper v. Apple Inc.*, 2019 WL 4783951, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 22, 2019)
 17 (finding cases related where the cases “center around the same technology and economic structures”).
 18 And both cases contain substantially identical causes of action against the defendants. In fact, all but
 19 two of the causes of action alleged by Plaintiff in *GoodRx* are also alleged by Plaintiff in *Hey Favor*.

20 Given these similarities, it is more than “likely that there will be an unduly burdensome
 21 duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different
 22 Judges.” Civ. L.R. 3-12(a). Having these cases heard by the same judge will increase efficiency and
 23 reduce the risk of conflicting results. In addition, discovery in these cases will likely raise common
 24 disputes surrounding discovery requests and productions, and relation will therefore increase efficiency
 25 with respect to discovery. *See Pepper*, 2019 WL 4783951, at *2 (finding relation proper where all
 26 cases “have yet to begin substantial discovery and so efficiency gains will be achieved in discovery”).

27 To the extent that the Court believes the claims against non-Meta defendants in *GoodRx* are
 28 distinct from the claims against Meta in that action and *Hey Favor*, once the matters are related the

1 Court can exercise its discretion, if necessary, to sever the claims against the non-Meta defendants. *See*
2 Fed. R. Civ. P. 21 (“The court may . . . sever any claim against a party.”); *Earth Island Inst. v. Quinn*,
3 56 F. Supp. 3d 1110, 1114 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (“The Court has broad discretion in determining whether
4 to order severance under Rule 21.” (citations omitted)).¹

5 Meta respectfully requests that the Court order that *GoodRx* is related to *Hey Favor*.

6
7 Dated: February 17, 2023

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

8 By: /s/ Lauren R. Goldman
9 Lauren R. Goldman

10 COOLEY LLP

11 By: /s/ Michael G. Rhodes
12 Michael G. Rhodes

13 *Attorneys for Meta Platforms, Inc. (formerly known as*
14 *Facebook, Inc.)*

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
1 It is Meta’s understanding that the *GoodRx* plaintiff will file an administrative motion to relate
GoodRx to *USA v. GoodRx Holdings, Inc.*, Case No. 4:23-cv-00460, also filed in the Northern
District of California. However, the *USA v. GoodRx* case has settled. It also involves different
claims filed by the federal government under different statutes governed by different standards.
GoodRx is not related to *USA v. GoodRx*.

CIVIL L.R. 5-1(h)(3) ATTESTATION

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5-1(h)(3), I, Lauren R. Goldman, hereby attest under penalty of perjury that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from all signatories.

Dated: February 17, 2023

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

By: /s/ Lauren R. Goldman
Lauren R. Goldman